

1. **Clarity/Organization/Title-** The proposal should be clear, concise, and well-organized. It should have been thoroughly proofread, with no obvious errors. (Take on the role of a copyeditor; can writing quality be improved?) The title of the proposal should be directly related to the content.

1-2 – Poor	3-4 – Marginal	5-6 – Good	7-8 – Exceptional
The quality of writing is poor. The proposal is filled with language errors. The proposal appears to have been written hastily with very little time given to proofreading.	The overall writing quality of the proposal is marginal and obvious errors are present. Multiple areas for improvement related to the title, clarity, and/or organization of the proposal can be identified.	The proposal is clearly written with no obvious errors. However, there may be a couple areas where suggestions for improvement to the title, clarity, and/or organization of the proposal can be made.	Writing quality is of a professional standard and the title directly relates to the proposal. No errors can be found, and the writing quality is of a high professional academic standard.

2. **Theoretical/Pedagogical soundness-** The proposal should reflect familiarity with current practice, theory, and/or research. The assumptions, premises, and/or empirical design upon which the proposal is based should be sound. In addition, it should appear that any necessary research has already been conducted; the abstract should not read as a research proposal.

1-2 – Poor	3-4 – Marginal	5-6 – Good	7-8 – Exceptional
<p>The proposal reflects no knowledge of field-specific theory, practice, and/or research. There also may be major flaws in the assumptions, premises, and/or design of the proposal.</p> <p>There may or may not be doubt that research connected to the proposal has been conducted.</p>	<p>The proposal reflects knowledge of some field-specific theory, practice, terminology, debates, and/or research but it may be outdated or have questionable relevance. There may be issues with the assumptions, premises, and/or design that would affect the results, outcome, and/or quality of the presentation.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>It is believed that the research connected to the proposal has not yet been conducted.</p>	<p>The proposal reflects a good knowledge of field-specific theory, practice, terminology, debates and/or research and it is directly connected to the proposal. There may be room for some improvement in the assumptions, premises, and/or design, but the results, outcome, and/or quality of the presentation should not be affected.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>It appears that any related research has already been conducted.</p>	<p>The proposal reflects an exceptional knowledge of field-specific theory, practice, terminology, debates, and/or research and it is directly connected to the proposal. There are no issues with the assumptions, premises, and/or design.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The abstract has clearly discussed the results of any research.</p>

3. **Knowledge or Skill Contribution** – Sessions at JALT International should provide new input in the form of up-to-date research or activities (ex. through workshops) that will help participants gain new knowledge and/or new skills. Highly rated presentations should make a strong contribution to one or both areas. (It should be noted that participants in the proposed sessions should be thought of as individuals involved in language teaching. DO NOT think of participants as SIG members of the proposed content area or highly experienced individuals within that field.)

1-2 – Poor	3-4 – Marginal	5-6 – Good	7-8 – Exceptional
The proposed session will contribute knowledge and/or a skill that is not appropriate to the broad field that JALT represents.	The proposed session will contribute knowledge and/or a skill that may be semi-related to the field that JALT represents, is outdated, and/or is common knowledge.	The proposed session will contribute knowledge and/or a skill that is directly related to the field, relatively new, and could be of interest to many participants.	The proposed session appears to be ground-breaking and field changing. It will make a significant contribution to the field.

4. **Overview of Content-** There should be an adequate explanation of what will be covered in the presentation and what is listed should be realistic for the length of the presentation. For workshops, it should be clear what new skill the participants will learn to do.

1-2 – Poor	3-4 – Marginal	5-6 – Good	7-8 – Exceptional
The proposed session is inappropriate for the proposed session type and there is no information of what will be presented and/or what participants will learn to do.	The proposed session is appropriate for the proposed session type, but it may not be clear what will be presented and/or what the participants will learn to do. There may also be unrealistic expectations regarding presentation length.	The proposed session is appropriate for the proposed session type. It is either implied or stated what will be presented and/or what the participants will learn to do. There may be slight concerns regarding the length of the presentation.	The proposed session is appropriate for the proposed session type. It is explicitly stated what will be presented and/or what the participants will learn to do. There is no doubt that the proposed content matches the proposed session length.